DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 665 SP 031 667

TITLE	Impact II Program.
INSTITUTION	IMPACT II--The Teachers Network, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	JDRP-87-15
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; *Instructional Improvement; Networks; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Developed Materials; *Teacher Participation; Validated Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Impact II

ABSTRACT

This document consists of a program description (including evidence of effectiveness) submitted by the developing institution to the Program Effectiveness Panel (PEP), formerly the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP), for validation as an exemplary program and eligibility for National Diffusion Network (NDN) funding as a "Developer-Demonstrator" project. IMPACT II is a model program that incorporates a process proven to disseminate teacher-developed, classroom-based programs for the improvement of instruction. The program identifies innovative teachers, awards grants to support the dissemination and adaptation of their exemplary projects, and establishes teacher networks. In order to facilitate the dissemination of good projects, the program sponsors workshops and conferences, annual catalogs, and interschool visits. The IMPACT II national organization provides technical assistance and dissemination guidelines to school systems interested in implementing the model. In a 3-year evaluation of the program experience in public and private schools, IMPACT II teachers were found, on average, to talk with 43 others about their ideas for better teaching. Participating teachers, compared to others, were more likely to use innovative ideas, and new methods of presentation, grouping and classroom management. Participants reported increases in self-esteem and greater professional commitment. The results were stable over time and across three sites. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

87-15 SP

FIFTH FLOOR
15 EAST 26TH STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10010
(212) 340-2990

ED340665

Abstract

IMPACT II is a model program that incorporates a process proven to disseminate teacher-developed, classroom-based programs for the improvement of instruction. IMPACT II identifies innovative teachers, awards grants to support the dissemination and adaptation of their exemplary projects, and establishes teacher networks. In order to facilitate the dissemination of good projects, IMPACT II sponsors workshops and conferences, annual catalogs, and interschool visits.

The IMPACT II national organization provides technical assistance and dissemination guidelines to school systems interested in implementing the IMPACT II model. The IMPACT II model program has been successfully adopted by 22 locations that include cities, states, and consortiums of suburban and rural communities.

In a three-year, quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the IMPACT II experience in public and private schools in New York and Houston, IMPACT II teachers were found, on average to talk with 43 others about their ideas for better teaching. Participating teachers, compared to others, were more likely to use innovative ideas, and new methods of presentation, grouping and classroom management. Participants reported increases in self-esteem and greater professional commitment. Moreover, the results were stable over time and across three sites.

Although the adaption of the IMPACT II model in the 20 subsequent sites has occurred after the evaluation was concluded, the attractiveness and utility of the IMPACT II model is a prima facie case for the model's ability to disseminate improved practice not only from teacher to teacher but also from site to site.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SP 031 667

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUBMITTAL
U.S. Department of Education
Joint Dissemination Review Panel

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION: IMPACT II Program
15 East 26 Street
New York, N.Y. 10010
(212) 340-2990

CONTACT PERSON: Ellen Dempsey,
Executive Director

B. ORIGINAL DEVELOPER:

Charlotte Frank, executive director, Division of Curriculum and Instruction; Ellen Dempsey, executive director, IMPACT II; and Deidre Meyerson, program director, IMPACT II originally developed the IMPACT II model in the New York City public schools. The IMPACT II model disseminates successful classroom-based projects developed by teachers in order to improve instruction.

APPLICANT AGENCY:

IMPACT II national is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization that provides technical assistance and dissemination guidelines to school systems interested in implementing the IMPACT II model.

C. YEARS OF IMPACT II PROGRAM MODEL

1977-79:	Program developed and implemented
1979-Present:	Operated
1981-82:	Evaluation of public school program in New York City
1982-83:	Evaluation of public school program in Houston and independent school program in New York
1983-Present:	National program dissemination

D. SOURCES AND LEVELS OF FUNDING

Period	Funds	Sources
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM		
1979-Present	$1,331,050	Exxon Education Foundation
	$1,023,902	New York City Board of Education
	$ 25,000	Booth Ferris Foundation
	$ 7,500	Morgan Guaranty & Trust Company
	$ 5,000	New York Times Company Foundation
	$ 5,000	Edwin Gould Foundation
NEW YORK CITY INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS		
1982-1986	$ 388,308	Exxon Education Foundation
HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT		
1982-Present	$ 675,000	Exxon Education Foundation
	$ 225,000	Houston Independent School District
NATIONAL DISSEMINATION PROJECT		
1983-84	$ 76,891	Exxon Education Foundation
1984-85	$ 198,539	Exxon Education Foundation
1985-86	$ 196,504	Exxon Education Foundation
	$ 130,000	Metropolitan Life Foundation
	$ 5,000	Polaroid Corporation
	$ 3,500	Hazen Foundation
1986-87	$ 97,782	Exxon Education Foundation
	$ 10,000	Polaroid Corporation
	$ 10,000	Boston Globe Foundation
	$ 5,000	American Express Foundation

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

A. Program Goals

The goals of IMPACT II are to: 1) disseminate exemplary programs (a)from teacher-to-teacher within educational organizations and (b)across sites; 2) improve instruction, 3) facilitate collegiality, and 4) keep good teachers teaching. (It is important to note that this program is designed to support the vast majority of teachers who are eager to improve their teaching.)

B. Purposes and Needs Addressed

IMPACT II is based on the philosophy that many successful projects start in the classroom and that teacher networking can be a most effective way of disseminating information about these projects, facilitating their adaptation, and improving instruction. By establishing teacher networks, IMPACT II also breaks through the isolation endemic to the field and enhances professional development. "Students benefit academically when their teachers share ideas, cooperate in activities and assist one another's intellectual growth." (What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning. U.S. Department of Education. 1986.)

IMPACT II recognizes and rewards innovative teachers, and supports their classroom work in order to keep good teachers teaching. The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that between 1989 and 1993 public schools will need one million new teachers. "Surveys reveal that teachers are deeply troubled, not only about salaries, but also about their loss of status, bureaucratic pressures, a negative public image, the lack of recognition and rewards. The push for excellence in education must begin by confronting those conditions that drive good teachers from the classroom." (Ernest L. Boyer, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. 1983.)

IMPACT II identifies outstanding teachers who can take on the responsibility of providing staff development within their schools and districts. The recent and widely-quoted Carnegie Report asserts that teachers should be "providing leadership in the redesign of schools and in helping their colleagues uphold the standards of learning and teaching." IMPACT II takes the next step by providing a mechanism that enables teachers to become resources for one another, and design ways in which to grow professionally.

C. Intended Audience

All teachers within a school system (or other jurisdiction, e.g. intermediate unit or region) that has adopted the IMPACT II model are eligible to participate in the IMPACT II program. Innovative teachers receive grants to disseminate projects they have developed; less experienced teachers, for the most part, or veteran teachers seeking new ways to enliven their classrooms and motivate their students receive grants to adapt these projects in their classrooms. Every teacher at an IMPACT II site is

encouraged to attend workshops, use the annual catalogs, participate in interschool visits, and apply for grants.

In order to sucessfully implement IMPACT II, a site must have a minimum of 2,000 teachers. Because IMPACT II is a networking program, a critical mass of participants is necessary for the program to have long-range positive effects. With a smaller pool of eligible participants, the growth of the network is limited. Therefore, school systems that have less than 2,000 teachers have joined together to form consortiums--at the state or regional level--in order to implement IMPACT II.

The IMPACT II model has been adopted by 22 sites across the country--Boston Public Schools (MA), Central Michigan Consortium (MI), Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools (NC), Central New York State Teacher Center (NY), Clark County School District (NV), Connecticut State Department of Education (CT), Corridor Partnership for Excellence in Education (IL), District of Columbia Public Schools (DC), Fairfax County Public Schools (VA), Houston Independent School District (TX), Jackson Public Schools (MS), Link--A Business and Education Partnership (WA), Los Angeles Educational Partnership (CA), Lubbock Independent School District (TX), New York City Public Schools (NY), Portland Public Schools (OR), Roanoke Valley (VA), Rockland County (NY), San Francisco Education Fund (CA), Santa Barbara County Schools (CA), Socorro Independent School District (TX) and Westchester County (NY). It has proven successful in cities, states, and with consortiums of rural and suburban communities.

D. Background and Theoretical Foundation

Teacher quantity goes up and down as a policy problem; teacher quality has always been an issue. The traditional methods of insuring or improving teacher quality have been three-fold. At intake, employing schools and districts try (a)to hire the best qualified candidates. Once hired, teachers are encouraged (b)to take additional university course work and are (c)required to be present at in-service activities. Dissatisfaction with all three methods is justly widespread.

In the 1960's Federally-sponsored programs of school improvement often tried to purchase improvement or to force it from the outside. Whether it was explained as "exogenous shock" or as "change agent" theory, the assumption about teacher inadequacy was clear. A partial exception for this pattern was the increased use of "minigrants," small amounts of money provided for specific activities that teachers were then to produce.

The efforts have been useful, but after the Rand Corporation's critiques of Federal programs supporting education change began to appear (1975), theorists and practitioners both began to rethink staff development. (For additional information about these issues, cf., Dale Mann,ed. Making Change Happen? (New York, Teachers College Press, 1976).

During this period, the Ford Foundation concluded that the lighthouse demonstration strategies and other frontal assaults were falling short of wholesale improvement and began to use litigation and the conscious creation of national networks of like-minded people who could then support and augment each others work.

The Exxon Education Foundation had for years been the first or second leading grant maker in "pre-collegiate education." Concerned about the quality of college teaching, Exxon put together a program that made a small amount of money available to professors who were then expected to communicate with each other and with non-grantee colleagues. The results were promising but not robust. In hindsight, the networking activities were under-managed and some key distinctions among participants by developmental level had not yet been recognized and incorporated in the networking procedures.

IMPACT II began with the college networking design but shaped it to the circumstances of elementary and secondary school teachers. To test the possibilities, Exxon decided to support a user-driven, teacher-to-teacher network in the least likely to succeed environment--New York City.

New York City was the initial proving ground for the several theories that are reflected in IMPACT II's procedures. First, the program assumes that teachers are stimulated by motives in addition to financial gains--self-actualization, the need to achieve--these incentives are present in much of the current literature about professionalization and empowerment.

Second, IMPACT II relies on the participation hypothesis: as involvement increases, resistance decreases and ownership, enthusiasm, and receptivity increase. Rather than being spectators in an in-service audience, or the passive objects of "more advanced" people's improvement efforts in a change-agent program, IMPACT II challenges grantees to initiate and be responsible for the improvement of themselves and others.

Third, IMPACT II's strategy is based on reference group theory. Adult learning is maximized by credible, often homophilous trainers. IMPACT II creates an alternate reference group of like-minded colleagues, people who are all teachers. The final refinement of reference group theory is rooted in Shoemaker's research indicating that diffusion often moves through strata of individuals beginning with the most secure, accomplished and motivated; to the next most, etc. IMPACT's "developer" to "adaptor" sequence reflects this "two-step" dissemination theory.

In summary, IMPACT II is an example of one of the major additions to social program architecture of the 1970's, networking as a systematic method of change. The principles of shared experience; affiliation over time, reciprocal, mutual benefit; open-ended voluntary participation; and a range of both professional and social encounters have now been concsiously designed into many

areas of public and private endeavour. Most of the principles were part of the IMPACT II program from the beginning; some were added in the course of the multi-year evaluation.

E. Features: How the Program Operates

IMPACT II awards small grants to teachers, but unlike minigrant programs, IMPACT II awards two different types of grants and the grantees become members of an ongoing network. IMPACT II begins by awarding a developer grant. This grant supports creative, effective classroom-based projects that already exist. The purpose of the developer grant is to assist teachers in refining their projects and packaging them for dissemination to other teachers. A second grant, called an adaptor grant, goes to those teachers who wish to adapt the ideas made available to them by developer teachers. Adaptation often crosses grade levels, subject areas, school borders and even district lines. The IMPACT II slogan "Take an Idea and Go Creative," represents the readiness of teachers to seek new teaching techniques, to make these ideas work in their classrooms, and to break down the classroom barriers that isolate teachers from each other.

IMPACT II has identified and funded projects in every subject area, including special education, and for every grade and ability level. Many of the projects are interdisciplinary and include such topics as "Writing through Video," "The Ocean as a Classroom," "Oral History Builds Basic Skills," and "Toys in Space."

Through teacher networking and program adaptation, teachers build on one another's projects. For example, an elementary school project that uses the school's public address system to broadcast a daily news show researched and written by fourth graders as part of their reading, writing, listening and speaking skills curriculum received an IMPACT II developer grant. An IMPACT II adaptor teacher uses the project in her communication arts course for high school students. Her students broadcast both news and school ball games via videotape in the school's gymnasium. The program has been such a success in both settings that it has been adapted by almost 20 teachers in the school system.

IMPACT II projects have introduced teachers to new areas of expertise and to exciting ways to involve students actively in their learning. By adapting IMPACT II computer projects teachers have learned to teach haiku poetry, geography and how to balance a checkbook. In the "Teacher Wanna Bees" project, qualified high school seniors are encouraged to consider teaching as a career and are given the opportunity to get "the view from the other side of the desk." In "Writing for Real Audiences," sixth graders and eleventh graders read and critique each other's writing on current events topics such as the death penalty. In the "Team A Tour of the USA" project, middle school students take part in a simulated vacation and learn to read maps, plan a budget, and research America's history.

Each IMPACT II site has a review committee made up of a majority of teachers to determine that site's annual developer grant awards. At some of the sites, business and community representatives have become involved in their local schools by participating on the review committee.

All of the IMPACT II sites recognize innovative and committed classroom teachers at an annual awards ceremony. Awards ceremonies are held at such non-school sites as museums, historical sites, hotels and corporate headquarters. IMPACT II also sponsors special events that bring teachers together to work collaboratively on improving instruction. For example, an all day conference was held at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. Teachers had the opportunity to attend art-related workshops led by IMPACT II developers, to take guided tours of the museum's collections, and to learn how to incorporate instant photography in the classroom at workshops organized by the Polaroid Education Program, a co-sponsor of the event.

Each teacher who receives an IMPACT II developer grant prepares a packet of materials for dissemination. the teacher meets with a staff member or consultant to review materials the teacher has developed for the project and to determine what other materials the teacher needs to develop. Ideally this meeting is held at the end of the school year; the teacher then completes his or her dissemination packet during the summer. Dissemination packets include such information as sample lesson plans, a list of basic materials required for implementing the project, information about outside resources that enhance the project and a bibliography. IMPACT II also sponsors workshops to train teachers in leading workshops and to provide them with an opportunity to practice presentation skills.

Through annual catalogs, workshops and interschool visits, IMPACT II enables teachers to contact and work with one another, to exchange ideas and materials and to implement projects in their classrooms.

Each IMPACT II site has its own staff, the size of which is determined by the number of teachers in the school system. The staff coordinates dissemination and recognition activities, and assists teachers in preparing workshop presentations and in developing dissemination materials.

The IMPACT II national organization disseminates the model program site-to-site. Technical assistance and program materials are made available to school systems and consortiums of school districts interested in adopting the model.

F. Significance of the Program

Efforts to improve the quality of existing teaching continue to rely on encapsulated, special purpose projects and faculty "in-service" activities. Despite more than a decade of research documenting the ability of schools to resist narrowly-focused, externally generated efforts, particular projects continue to be fielded around special topics (e.g., how to teach bilingual students), staffed by

outsiders, and inserted into schools. And, building principals continue to convene their faculties after school on a regular basis to make announcements and provide "resource speakers," "experts" and others whose work may lead to improvement. There are some results from both modes but there is more dissatisfaction, especially given the fact that American schools spend about 1.6 percent of the nearly $150 billion cost for public elementary and secondary education on improvement activities.

IMPACT II is the first systematically constructed attempt to apply networking techniques to American teachers. While teacher centers use some methods, they do not differentiate among teachers, (e.g., the developer/adaptor distinction) and they do not usually provide the management infrastucture necessary to facilitate a network (e.g., catalogs, telephone trees, interschool visits budgets).

The need for stronger, more effective teaching is a constant theme in reform efforts. The creation and refinement of teacher-to-teacher networking is a tool that can strengthen the practice and improve the morale of a significant fraction of America's 2.3 million person teaching force.

III. POTENTIAL FOR TRANSPORTABILITY

A. Settings and Participants (Development and Evaluation Sites)

IMPACT II programs adapted from the basic model have been established by school systems, an entire state, education foundations and teacher centers in 22 diverse sites around the country. The program is found in almost every educational setting including urban, suburban, rural--affluent and poor. The school populations include almost all minorities and ethnic groups.

The original pilot projects in New York and Houston included a vast variety of socio-economic ethnic minority populations. At the time (1979), New York had 1264 schools, 963,048 students (70% minority and 30% non-minority), 49,497 teachers, and a school system budget of $3.257 billion. In 1982, at the time of that program's inception, Houston had 237 schools, 194,436 students (78% minority and 22% non-minority), and 10,833 teachers, and a school system budget of $528 million.

IMPACT II programs around the country have awarded over 10,000 grants to classroom teachers and included many thousands of additional teachers in IMPACT II networking activities as "informal" adaptors. The program has also attracted a network of superintendents and principals who actively support teachers in the IMPACT II program. The program has also enlisted the support of foundations, corporations and businesses at each local site. This aspect of the program provides special community recognition for the teachers and financial support for portions of the program that might not be supportable through tax dollars.

B. Transportable Components and Documentation

All aspects of the program are appropriate for dissemination to other sites. The IMPACT II Handbook has been developed as a how-to guide for sites interested in adopting the model. In addition, the following support materials are available to other sites: sample grant applications, screening forms, rating forms, evaluation forms and dissemination interview forms; sample award ceremony programs and certificates; sample workshop flyers and workshop evaluation forms; sample catalog, dissemination guidelines and log sheets; sample brochures and newsletters; sample budgets; and numerous published articles that describe how and why the model works.

C. User Requirements

User school districts, teacher centers, education foundations, states or consortiums of school districts must have a minimum total population of 2,000 teachers--the critical number for maintaining and expanding a network that is vital and offers on-going opportunities for growth for all kinds of teachers. Administrative support for all program activities must be provided by superintendents and principals to allow teachers to be released for interschool visits, workshops and other networking activities. The program should be designed to include the basic model of developer and adaptor grants, the catalog of teacher-developed programs and a series of networking activities such as workshops and award ceremonies. Local program staff must include a coordinator and secretary. The coordinator may be selected from an existing staff position such as a staff development director. The staff position can be redesigned to include the duties of the IMPACT II coordinator.

D. Costs (For Implementation and Operation)

The planning portion of the program lasts approximately six months and costs about $5,934. Program costs are recurring from year to year, and vary according to the size of the teacher population. A typical small size program for a school district or consortium of school districts will cost about $88,500 per year. A larger size program such as a statewide program will cost approximately $129,500 per year. The total budgets include all personnel costs. In many cases the personnel costs will be a reallocation of an existing staff position.

A review of the budgets of the pilot programs in New York and Houston during the first year of each pilot indicates that the per capita cost for teachers in New York was $4.94 and in Houston was $13.84. Per capita figures are based on the total number of teachers at a site. Every teacher is eligible to participate in IMPACT II networking activities. We have documented that many teachers do not formally apply for grants but attend workshops, participate in interschool visits, contact teachers for information using IMPACT II catalogs, and become "informal adaptors."

Training in fundraising strategies is part of the IMPACT II technical assistance and should help to supplement program costs.

Program Installation Costs

Planning (1 year only)	
Personnel Training & Technical Assistance	
IMPACT II Staff (2 staff trainers) ($400 day @ 4 days)	$1,600
Travel Lodging & Meals for Trainers (2 staff members @ $750 ea)	1,500
Materials	1,500
Indirect Costs (29%)	1,334
Total:	$5,934

Small to Medium Size Program (2,000-10,000 teachers)

Staff	
Administrator (1/2 time) salary plus fringes	$21,000
Secretary-salary plus fringes	15,000
Consultants (evaluation and documentation)	10,000
General Administration (telephone, photocopying, postage, supplies, etc.)	6,000
Office Supplies	1,000
Printing (newsletter, announcements, brochures, catalog)	10,000
Conferences and Workshops	2,500
Local Travel	500
Grant Awards	
Developer grants 30 @ $300	9,000
Adaptor grants 40 @ $200	8,000
Substitute Teachers (50 days @ $50 per day)	2,500
Teacher Hourly (200 hours @ $15 per hour for workshop leadership)	3,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	$88,500

Large Size Program (Over 10,000 teachers)

PERSONNEL:	
Program Administrator (salary plus fringes)	$42,000
Secretary (salary plus fringes)	16,000
Substitute Teachers 50 days @ $50 per day	2,500
Teacher Hourly 300 hours @ $15 per hour	4,500
TOTAL PERSONNEL:	$65,000
PROGRAM EXPENSES:	
Consultant Services 100 days @ $100 per day	$10,000
Printing	15,000
Grant Awards:	
Developer Grants 50 @ $300	15,000
Adaptor Grants 100 @ $200	20,000
Office Supplies	2,000
Telephone	2,000
Local Travel	500
TOTAL PROGRAM EXPENSES:	$ 64,500
TOTAL BUDGET:	$129,500

IV. EVIDENCE

A. CLAIM STATEMENTS

1. CLAIM: TEACHER-TO-TEACHER DISSEMINATION, IMPROVED INSTRUCTION, FACILITATION OF COLLEGIALITY, MOTIVATION OF GOOD TEACHERS

IMPACT II teachers disseminate their innovative ideas, change their teaching approaches, reduce their isolation, and increase their self-esteem, attitudes about teaching and commitment to the profession. While these are four distinct accomplishments, they are presented as one claim because they are interrelated.

a) Teacher-to-Teacher Dissemination

The average grantee talked to 43 other teachers about the innovative ideas that IMPACT II had supported during a single year. In light of the fact that half the control group--non-grantee--respondents report never having been in another teacher's classroom, IMPACT II's 1:43 dissemination ratio is a startling accomplishment. Over the course of participants' respective grant years, two sets of data from IMPACT II project developers/disseminators and IMPACT II adaptors indicate that both groups have disseminated exemplary, innovative programs either developed or adapted by them to teachers both within and beyond their official IMPACT II network and funding period.

b) Improved Instruction

After a year's participation in IMPACT II, teachers were almost twice as likely to change their teaching approach from large group presentation to greater reliance on small group, individualized, interdisciplinary, independent, and student-directed instruction. These changes were self-reported in a questionnaire inquiring into their teaching strategies before and after receiving minigrants. Additional survey data from 1983 indicates large proportions of program participants believe IMPACT II positively influenced how they use innovative teaching ideas, present material, group students for instruction, and manage their classrooms.

c) Facilitation of Collegiality

IMPACT II reduced the typical isolation among participating teachers and increased collegiality by establishing a networking system through which they could meet and/or exchange innovative ideas and exemplary practices with other teachers. Among the 1981-82 IMPACT II grantees, 50 percent of the adaptors and 33 percent of the developers chose "networking" as the most important benefit to them of program participation. This networking feature is what makes IMPACT II different from a traditional minigrant program and it is one of the engines of teacher-to-teacher dissemination.

d) Motivation of Good Teachers

IMPACT II increased teacher self esteem, attitudes about teaching, and commitment to the profession. These changes were reported from survey data of two separate cohorts and the longitudinal sample.

B. TEACHER-TO-TEACHER DISSEMINATION, IMPROVED INSTRUCTION, FACILITATION OF COLLEGIALITY, MOTIVATION OF GOOD TEACHERS

1. Methodology: Summary

The evaluation used a cross-sectional, cross-site pre-post, experimental/control, quantitative/qualitative design to measure changes in attitude, behavior and knowledge, supplemented by four-year longitudinal evidence. The analyses are based on stratified samples drawn from New York City public and private schools and Houston public schools.

a) Design, sample, and data collection

The research methods were developed over a period of three years. Two distincts waves of data collection and analysis took place, the first in 1980-81 with New York City public school teachers; followed by the 1983 effort which was far more extensive in terms of numbers, roles and sites.

The 1980-81 analysis was based on 136 respondents from among that year's 192 grantees (response rate, 71 percent) who were sent a single, 60 item, 12 page questionnaire. Responses about the IMPACT II experience were requested during the spring of the year in which grantees had received their grant awards. In order to approximate a control group, the 79 teachers who had applied for but not received IMPACT II grants were also surveyed. This unfunded applicant group was similar to the grantees in institutional

assignment, gender, and initiative. In order to study the networking aspect of IMPACT II, the logs kept by developers of their teacher-to-teacher contacts were content analyzed.

Analysis of the data was conducted using SPSS and appropriate measures of joint occurrence. Reported differences were either significant at the .05 level or discussed in terms of frequency distribution. (The results are available in Dale Mann, "The Impact of IMPACT II," Teachers College Record, Vol. 84, No. 4 (Summer 1983) and Mann, "The Impact of IMPACT II," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 63, No. 9 (May 1982). See attached.

The 1980-81 analysis provided the base for a much more extensive and comprehensive examination of the IMPACT II experience in 1982-83. By 1982-83, IMPACT II was operating in three sites (New York City public and private schools plus the Houston public schools). One hundred thirty-two grantees (36 percent of the 366 total grantees) responded to the survey. The respondents resembled all grantees in every aspect except gender where a larger proportion were female. In order to compare grantee attitudes and behavior with all teachers, a random sample, stratified to replicate the bio-social and institutional assignments of all teachers in each site was selected.

Another 266 teachers were also surveyed in New York in the spring of 1983. Fifty-eight of the original, 1979 grantees were studied to estimate the duration of the IMPACT II effects. One hundred forty-eight "in-school controls" (that is, otherwise similar teachers without IMPACT II grants, selected from the same schools as grantees) were studied in order to ascertain if there were particular features of the school building culture that might account for the effects otherwise attributed to IMPACT II. Finally, 60 non-response checks were conducted by postcard and telephone to verify the accuracy of the random all-teacher sample. This intense data collection could only be justified among the New York City public schools since the program had by then been in place for four years but had only just begun in the other sites. (See Figure 1 "Samples.")

Figure 1:

Samples, 1980-83, All Sites

A) 1980-81, New York City	Developers	61
	Adaptors	75
	Unfunded Applicants	44
	Total:	180

B) 1983, All sites

	New York City* Public Schools	New York City Independent Schools	Houston Public Schools	Total
Grantees	73	10	49	132
Randoms	214	19	72	305
Totals:	287	29	121	435

*Additional NYC public

Developers	43
Adaptors	30
In-school controls	148
Randoms	214
1979 Longitudinal non-response checks grantees	60
Developers	29
Adaptors	29
Totals:	553

The 1983 analysis was both pre/post and experimental/control. Grantees were surveyed in an initial wave soon after being notified of the award and then again in the spring of their grant year. There were two kinds of control or non-grantee groups--the in-school controls and the all-system random sample. All three sites had random respondents.

Longitudinal data were collected from the earliest cohort of grantees who were asked to recall aspects of their earlier experience and who were queried about their continuing involvement. Those findings were corroborated by examination of IMPACT II program files recording workshop attendance, interschool visits, requests for materials, etc.

The quantitative data were initially analyzed for two sorts of findings--unusually strong and interesting effects and unexpected, a priori unlikely findings. Field visits to conduct interviews and collect qualitative data were then commissioned in the spring of 1983. Twenty IMPACT II respondents were visited in their classrooms and interviewed using a fixed-system, free response protocol based on the questionnaire plus topics of opportunity that had arisen in the quantitative analysis. Interviews lasted from 30 to 120 minutes; all were conducted by the principal investigator or research associate; for the most part, field notes were reduced along the lines suggested by the quantitative analysis.

The field visits were a chance to confirm the veracity of unexpected findings. For example, the quantitative responses indicated that teachers did not care about the (objectively) small size of the grants, would not have done more if paid more, and were generally indifferent to economic inducements to improve teaching.

b) Instruments

The analysis was based on data collected from nine questionnaires. While many items were common, special items had to be developed to surface possible differences between developers and adaptors, pre and post experiences, experimentals and controls, etc. Most items were sui generis to this inquiry. Other items were adapted from standard measures of social psychological phenomena. A third group of items measured the respondents' knowledge about good teaching practices. These items were taken from the public item pool of ETS's National Teacher Exam and from a Delphi analysis that had been conducted to identify the properties of an instructionally effective school. (CF. Dale Mann with Judith Lawrence, "A Delphi Analysis of the Instructionally Effective School," New York, Teachers College, conducted for the National Institute of Education, 1982.)

c) Data Analysis

All quantitative data were coded and check coded for the statistical analysis which used a DEC 20 at Teachers College, Columbia University. Parametric and non-parametric

statistics were used as appropriate. Main effects were significant at the .05 level unless otherwise noted.

2. RESULTS

A. Teacher-to-Teacher Dissemination

Over the course of each academic/grant year since its inception in 1979, IMPACT II has succeeded in spreading exemplary programs developed by classroom teachers and in demonstrating its effectiveness as a "two-step" teacher-to-teacher dissemination program. Of the 1178 program participants from 1979 to 1983, 75 percent have engaged in disseminating their work; and 90 percent have talked to other teachers about their projects and encouraged them to apply.

The average grantee was found to talk with 43 other teachers during the course of the grant year. Forty percent of all the teachers who ever had grants continued to take part in IMPACT II activities, even though the program rules exclude them from grant renewals and in some cases it has been three years since they had the benefit of the grant resources. Ninety percent of all grantees would repeat the experience if they had the chance and that probably accounts for the 100 program veterans who encouraged 600 of their colleagues to apply.

The adaptor group is particularly important in this dissemination process. Teachers who apply to adapt the work of the developer grantees turned out to be slightly less experienced and slightly less confident about their abilities than the developers. Adaptors are in the next strata down from "master teachers." Even though adaptors received smaller grants and were less directly involved in IMPACT II, they were more likely than developers to have tried to convince other teachers to use effective grouping and new instructional strategies. By design, IMPACT II uses developers to work on adaptors: in effect, the program manages the developers and the developers manage the adaptors.

B. Improved Instruction

IMPACT II improved the instruction of 57 percent of the grant recipients over the course of the 1982-83 grant year by increasing their use of teaching strategies suggested in the research literature to be more effective. Among developers, a majority said they increased their use of small group instruction, individualized instruction, and interdisciplinary instruction. In addition to these three strategies, increased reliance on independent study projects and student self-instruction were reported by a majority of adaptors.

<u>For four of the five instructional/grouping approaches, adaptors reported more changes than developers, thereby indicating the intended goal of using developers to improve the instruction of the adaptors was achieved</u>.

Although impacting student test scores is too attenuated an effect to be designated a program goal, and although a very small fraction of developer projects related

to skills measured by achievement tests, both developers and adaptors attributed positive student outcomes to their own participation in IMPACT II.

In the 1982-83 group of grantees, for example, 70 percent claimed learning gains for their students, 75 percent said their students were learning different things, 66 percent reported their students were better motivated, 60 percent declared students enjoyed learning more, 91 percent believed student discipline had improved, and 82 percent reported better student attendance--all due to IMPACT II.

- 80 percent report IMPACT II influenced their use of innovative teaching ideas.
- 70 percent report IMPACT II influenced the way they present material.
- 60 pecent report the project influenced their student grouping practices and classroom management.

A large proportion also believed there has been continued improvement in student achievement, attendance and discipline even after the grant year was over.

Longitudinal data corroborated these results, with over 66 percent of the 1979 sample claiming that they had become more effective teachers because of their involvement in IMPACT II.

Before IMPACT II, about 75 percent of a sample of 1981-82 grantees relied primarily on large group instruction techniques. However, after a single year's participation, 57 percent (60 percent of adaptors, 54 percent of developers) reported increased use of small group instruction as compared to 31 percent of a control group of the unfunded applicants reporting a similar change. Within the treatment group, adaptors evidenced a greater increase in use of these teaching techniques than developers by margins ranging from 6 percent to 16 percent. A year later, 80 percent of the adaptors also reported that IMPACT II had influenced their use of innovative teaching ideas. These results indicate that (a) developers were indeed more accomplished teachers at the outset than adaptors, with less room for improvement (thus, a ceiling effect was probably in evidence), and (b) they were successful in influencing the instructional techniques of the adaptors through disseminating their own exemplary practices.

C. Facilitation of Collegiality

Half the teachers in the random sample reported never having visited another classroom in their careers. A typical meeting for teachers is after school hours, on a bi-monthly basis, at which someone else imparts information. Teachers seldom have an opportunity to discuss professional matters, share notes, or otherwise act as members of a profession.

The typical minigrant program does not address that need. During the 1980-81 study, we had an opportunity to analyze a program, operated by a New York community school district that was in every particular identical to IMPACT II except that it lacked the networking activities (award

ceremonies, receptions, interschool visits, etc.) Individual teachers did exactly what they were supposed to do with their grants but when the money ended so did the activities, and there were no changes in teacher collegiality, sharing or self-esteem. By contrast, a great deal of the IMPACT II effort is spent exactly on building, maintaining, and expanding networks of like-minded professionals. This collegiality is nearly certainly one of the major engines of the program's success.

Half of the adaptors and a third of the developers chose "networking" as the most important benefit to them of the program.

D. Motivating Good Teachers

Eighty-five percent of the participants report gains in self-esteem and professional satisfaction as a result of their participation in IMPACT II. At the beginning of the grant period, most teachers reported that they did not believe that other's valued their opinions or that they were recognized for their accomplishments. At the end of the grant period, i.e., at the end of a year in which the program's management, central office officials, and public groups including local business celebrated the grantee's accomplishment, that had radically changed. Forty percent report that their assessment of teaching has improved because of the grant activity.

IMPACT II teachers also feel more respected than their colleagues do. Grantees receive significantly more recognition for their innovative ideas and as a group, they find teaching more emotionally rewarding. Fewer than 10 percent say they are "burned out." Grantees are more positive in their estimate of the public's support for their schools; they feel less abused by the media, and they are prouder of the schools where they teach.

Nine out of ten gave the program top rating, and the majority cite new teaching ideas, intellectual stimulation, learning about other schools as benefits of IMPACT II. More than four-fifths feel better about themselves as professionals as a result of their participation in IMPACT II. Forty percent say their feelings about the world of teaching have improved with the grant.

C. INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFFECT AND TREATMENT

Two teacher assessments were used as part of the pre-post design of the evaluation--intems from the Instructionally Effective School which measures teacher awareness and implementation of effective practice (i.e. their attidudes and behaviors); and the National Teachers Examination which tests knowledge of preferred teaching methods. Though it was assumed that dissemination and instructional improvement would occur primarily to and within the adaptor group, there were no statistically significant pre-post score differences for them on either measure between November 1982 and May 1983. Since their high pre-test scores indicate that they already incorporated

good practices into their teaching before applying for an IMPACT II grant (and selection in fact was based on just such criteria), it is not surprising to find a ceiling effect, even among the adaptors.

However, when asked directly both on questionnaires and in interviews, the vast majority of adaptors and developers insisted that IMPACT II improved their teaching in ways described earlier and that they made dissemination contacts far beyond their own numbers. Given the minimal room for instructional improvement within both groups, it is arguable that a teacher's own self-assessment is the most sensitive measure available and provides credible testimony to program effectiveness.

2. CONTROL OF RIVAL HYPOTHESES

The strongest evidence supporting attribution of effects to the IMPACT II intervention is the cross-site phenomenon followed by the longitudinal outcomes. The public and private schools of New York could not be more different. Working conditions, teacher certification and recruitment, parent and student groups--are all dramatically different. Similarly, at the time of this analysis, New York's economy and circumstances were very different from the then boom-town atmosphere of a then rapidly growing Houston. Houston's teachers were younger, supervised far more closely, less unionized than their New York counterparts. Such institutional and cultural differences should disable weak interventions or at least wash out their effects. Instead all results are virtually indistinguishable among the three settings. When main effects run across three such disparate places, the most plausible explanation is that the intervention has connected with a central, pivotal defining property of the phenomenon--in this instance, teacher professionalism and collegiality as a dynamic harnessed through the dissemination procedures of IMPACT II.

A similar interpretation can be made with respect to the longitudinal data.

D. SIGNIFICANCE OF RESULTS

1. RELATIONSHIP OF RESULTS TO NEEDS

Given the high pre-program test scores among IMPACT II grantees on tests of knowledge, attitudes and behavior related to good teaching practice and the negligible, if any, room for improvement, it is a remarkable achievement to generate for them the perception of professional growth. While a similar impression of progress among teachers at the bottom of the scale could be a dangerous delusion and disincentive to innovate, the opposite seems to be true for those at the top.

Whether actual self-improvement is detectable through paper and pencil tests and gain scores or not, top quality teachers are driven by the urge to excellence and need to believe that they are continually improving themselves and contributing to others in order to sustain their professional motivation, emotional satisfaction, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

commitment. They are also the people who are most needed in their profession and if they themselves feel they have reached the ceiling of what they can accomplish as teachers, they are the most likely and able to leave in search of greater challenges.

2. COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Although there is abundant evidence critical of minigrant programs and there is evidence critical of in-service and staff development under the traditional assumptions (see Dale Mann, "The Politics of Staff Development" in ibid, Making Change Happen?), no program has incorporated all the features of IMPACT II. Therefore, to date, no appropriate comparison is available.